

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 4-8 and 36 stand rejected. Claims 37-41 are objected to. Claims 1-3 and 9-35 are allowable. Herein, no Claim has been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-41 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

Specification

The Specification has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error.

35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It was stated that Claims 4 and 6 recite "said plurality of fields" without an antecedent basis.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from Independent Claim 1. Element c) of Independent Claim 1 recites, "searching for a plurality of codes in *a plurality of*

fields in a first portion of said particular packet," (emphasis added). Thus, the antecedent basis for the recitation "said plurality of fields" in Claims 4 and 6 is found in Independent Claim 1. Thus, Claims 4-8 are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(a) and (e) Rejections

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by Chauvel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,291 (hereafter Chauvel). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 36 recites:

A method of processing a data stream having a plurality of packets, comprising the steps of:

- a) parsing said plurality of packets **to determine a plurality of parsing result codes for each packet**,
- b) **adding** said plurality of parsing result codes **to each packet**,
- c) creating an index table having said parsing result codes and a plurality of packet pointers indicating where said packets are located in a mass storage device;
- d) storing said packets; and
- e) selecting one or more of said stored packets to send to a decoder using said index table, wherein said index table facilitates decoding said packets. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Chauvel does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 36. In particular, Independent Claim

36 recites the limitations, "parsing said plurality of packets ***to determine a plurality of parsing result codes for each packet***," (emphasis added), and "***adding*** said plurality of parsing result codes ***to each packet***," (emphasis added). In contrast, Chauvel is directed to receiving packets, to discarding immediately all packets that do not have a valid PID (packet identification number), and to detecting packets with a valid PID. [Chauvel; Col.2, lines 16-22; Col 2, line 66 through Col. 3, line 6]. Since all packets that do not have a valid PID are discarded immediately, it is not possible to determine a plurality of parsing result codes for each packet, as in the invention of Independent Claim 36. Further, since all packets that do not have a valid PID are discarded immediately, it is not possible to add the plurality of parsing result codes to each packet, as in the invention of Independent Claim 36. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 36 is not anticipated by Chauvel and is in condition for allowance.

Objected Claims

Dependent Claims 37-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (Independent Claim 36), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 37-41 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 36. Hence, Dependent Claims 37-41 are allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Allowable Claims

Claims 1-3 and 9-35 have been allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments, and remarks overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-41) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-41) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 10/6/2005

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060